



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,152	04/27/2001	Osamu Sameshima	43890-513	7309

7590 02/08/2005

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY  
600 13th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

SAJOUS, WESNER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2676

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/843,152

Applicant(s)

SAMESHIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Wesner Sajous

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.

2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-12 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-12 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Remark**

This communication is responsive to the amendment and response filed on 9/21/2004. Claims 1-3, and 5-12 are presented for examination.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, and 5-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (US Pat. 5,818,425) in view of Monroe et al. (US 2002/0097322).

Considering claims 1 and 2, Wang discloses a wireless display system (see fig. 1) comprises plural personal computers (e.g., item 20, 30, and 40 of fig. 1) having wireless communication function (via items 27, 37, 47 and/or item 56 of fig. 1); and a wireless display (50) having wireless communication function and a display function (via item 56 of fig. 1). See col. 3, lines 16-66.

Art Unit: 2676

Although Wang discloses that inputs from each of the portable computers can be provided to display (50) of computer (51) via wireless communication (see abstract and col. 4, lines 18-64); Wang fails to specifically teach a display unit that simultaneously displays screens of some of a plurality of computers through wireless communication, and the wireless display has an input function that operates the plural computers (in Re claim 1), wherein the screens are displayed simultaneously by dividing the display unit of the wireless display (in Re claim 2).

Monroe, in a similar art, teaches the functional equivalence for simultaneously displays a plurality of screens on a display unit (e.g., display signals or videos of multiple different cameras on a single screen. See paragraphs 79, 97 of pages 6 and 7). In addition, Monroe discloses the wireless display (*i.e., the primary monitor*) has an input function (*i.e., a double left and right click or a drag/drop operation and/or a point-click-and-drag feature using mouse pointer*) to operate the plural computers (e.g., to select, display and control any of the secondary monitors). See paragraphs 21-22, and 24-26. Note that the cameras signals can be transmitted to the display via wireless communication (see paragraph 61), wherein the each of the video camera signals is characterized herein as an independent screen, which can be associated with PC monitor screen, as implied at paragraph 81 in page 6. At fig. 6, Monroe simultaneously displays a plurality of screens (104A to 104D) on a display unit (100) by dividing the display unit of the wireless display (see paragraph 97).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to modify the wireless communication and students/teacher

Art Unit: 2676

interaction disclosed in Want to include multiple divided screens displayed on a single display unit with input that operates the plural monitors via wireless communication as taught in the same conventional manner by Monroe, in order to permit conservation of bandwidth requirement and allow a user to monitor more than one screen simultaneously. See Monroe's paragraphs 44 and 57-58.

Re claim 3, it is noted that since the user of the main display in Monroe is able to switch over to view of a selected camera display as he/she desires (paragraphs 94 and 97), a specific code or indication must be provided via the user input device in order for the main display to recognize and display the desired screen's signal. Hence, Monroe teaches the features of claim 3. See claim 1 for reason of obviousness.

Re claims 6 and 8, Wang discloses the wireless display includes a touch panel that has the input function. See col. 5, lines 50-61.

Re claim 7, the claimed "common operation screen... in the plural personal computers" is met by Wang's col. 5, lines 5-21.

Re claims 9-10, It is noted that since in Monroe an icon is used to confirm the selection of a specific camera screen, and upon the user selection a screen camera is tied to a highlighted camera to identify the specific event caused by the camera (see paragraph 101 of page 8); thus, the wireless display of Monroe provides the functional equivalence for outputting an indicator, which includes changing the color of the corresponding screen of the display unit, in response to an occurrence at a personal computer as claimed. Wherein the highlighting and display functions correspond to the changes of color and the icon is characterized as the indicator. Therefore, Monroe when

Art Unit: 2676

combined with the Wang reference meets the limitations of claims 9 and 10. See claim 1 for reason of obviousness.

Re claim 11, the claimed "occurrence includes a specified key being entered..." is met by Wang's col. 4, lines 20-62.

Re claim 12, the claimed "display includes a processing unit for converting data received from a personal computer into information identifying the personal computer" is equivalently met by items 51 and 57 of Wang. See col. 4, lines 23-29. Note that it is industry standard for personal computers to include processing unit to convert and process information for display, either locally or remotely.

3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Monroe, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Panasik (US Pat. 6219553).

Re claim 5, Wang discloses most claimed features of the invention, but Wang fails to teach that the plurality of computers, which are wireless, are capable to communicate between themselves.

Panasik teaches the plurality of computers, which are wireless, are capable to communicate between themselves (see col. 3, lines 44-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Wang reference to include the features of Panasik, in order allow easy interaction between each of the students of the computer users.

Art Unit: 2676

***Conclusion***

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Box

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE")

Or:

(703) 308-5359 for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED"

or DRAFT")

Art Unit: 2676

Hand-held delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA, 6th floor (receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the  
examiner should be directed to Wesner Sajous whose telephone number is (703) 308-  
5857. The examiner can also be reached on Mondays thru Thursdays and on alternate  
Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's  
Supervisor, Matthew Bella, can be reached at (703) 308-6829. The fax phone number  
for this group is (703) 308-6606.

**Wesner Sajous -WS-**

**February 3, 2005**



**MATTHEW C. BELLA**  
**SUPERVISOR / SENIOR EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**